

### **REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 29, 2006. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. By the present amendment, claims 1, 4, 9, 18 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the claims in particular claims 4 and 22. Claims 4 and 22 have been amended in a way believed to address and overcome the Examiner's objections. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0078224 to Schramm-Apple (hereinafter Ref. 1). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection, but has amended claims 1 and 9 to provide clarification for the present invention.

Ref. 1 is directed to a searching tool that provides searches for medical personal based on preselected categories of information resources. The system of Ref. 1 provides "buckets" which are preselected (page 7 paragraph [0095] first 10 lines) by a user based on the types of information sources that the user desires search results from. When a search is performed, those documents that fit within the preselected buckets are displayed under a category title for that bucket (see page 7, paragraph [0097], first 10 lines). While this has the effect of organizing search information, Ref. 1 fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the present claims.

Claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, a method for organizing document search results including identifying words in raw search results documents having an association with search query terms, categorizing features of the words in relation to the search query terms to determine presentation categories based on the search query terms, and presenting the results in at least one category in accordance with the features.

In accordance with the present claims, the search query is employed as a basis for categorizing the search results as claimed. Raw search results documents having an association with search query terms are identified, and features of the words in relation to the search query terms are used to determine presentation categories based on the search query terms.

By contrast, in Ref. 1, the categories are preselected even before the search is done. In Ref. 1, the user sets up which medical resources will be searched in advance of the search. The categories are not determined based on the search terms and not categorized based on the search terms as essentially described in the present claims.

In addition, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Ref. 1 for presenting the results in at least one category in accordance with the features, where the features were categorized as features of the words in the raw search results.

The Examiner cites paragraph [0105] of Ref. 1 to teach the steps of the present claims; however, the present steps are not disclosed or suggested in paragraph [0105] or anywhere in Ref. 1. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance over Ref. 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited for at least the stated reasons.

Claim 9 includes, *inter alia*, a method for presenting search results including searching ... documents ... to retrieve documents as a result of a query term matching with a matched token in one or more of the documents, selecting at least one document term in a set of the document terms, the document terms being in proximity to the matched token, categorizing the selected document terms into at least one category to provide the at least one category which is related to the search query term, describing the categories using one or more category terms, and presenting a hit list of the documents with the one or more category terms associated with each of the documents.

As described above, Ref. 1 selects “buckets” in advance of the search and the search is carried out by submitting a query to an information source for each “bucket” (see e.g., paragraph [0097] first 10 lines). When the search returns documents, the documents are already in the “buckets” and can be displayed under the “bucket” heading.

In accordance with claim 9, a query term is matched with a matched token in the documents and then at least one document term in a set of the document terms is selected. The document terms are selected based on proximity to the matched token. The selected document terms are categorized into at least one category to provide the at least one category which is related to the search query term. In this way, the categories are set depending on the results of the search and relative to the query terms. The documents are then organized using category terms, and presented as a hit list of the documents with the category terms associated with each of the documents.

To review, the query term uncovers matched tokens in a document. The matched tokens are employed to determine a category term and the documents are organized according

to the category terms. The categories are extracted from the documents returned by the search in accordance with the query terms. This is completely different from Ref. 1 which preselects the sources of a search (buckets in paragraph [0095]) and displays the search results for each bucket. Therefore, it is believed that Ref. 1 fails to disclose or suggest at least: selecting at least one document term in a set of the document terms, the document terms being in proximity to the matched token, and categorizing the selected document terms into at least one category to provide the least one category which is related to the search query term as set forth in claim 9. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited for at least the stated reasons.

Claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, a document search presentation system including a feature extractor configured to extract and select features within documents provided in accordance with a search query, a feature categorizer coupled to the feature extractor, the feature categorizer associating the features in the documents to categories in accordance with taxonomy categories, and a format, which presents at least a portion of the documents in association with a category of the taxonomy categories.

Ref. 1 fails to disclose or suggest at least: a feature extractor, which extracts and selects features within documents provided in accordance with a search query. Ref. 1 also fails to disclose or suggest a feature categorizer coupled to the feature extractor, the feature categorizer associating the features in the documents to categories in accordance with taxonomy categories.

No extraction of features from discovered documents in accordance with a search query is disclosed or suggested by Ref. 1. Instead, after a search is performed, the

documents uncovered by the search are simply placed in the respective buckets based on the preselected search categories defined by the user. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Ref. 1 for a feature categorizer coupled to the feature extractor, the feature categorizer associating the features in the documents to categories in accordance with taxonomy categories. The features in the searched documents are not associated with taxonomy categories in Ref. 1. Instead, the associations of documents are based on user selected search resource types.

Therefore, it is believed that Ref. 1 fails to disclose or suggest at least: including a feature extractor, which extracts and selects features within documents provided in accordance with a search query, a feature categorizer coupled to the feature extractor, the feature categorizer associating the features in the documents to categories in accordance with taxonomy categories, and a format, which presents at least a portion of the documents in association with a category of the taxonomy categories, as set forth in claim 18. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited for at least the stated reasons.


It is also submitted that the dependent claims are believed to be allowable over the cited art for other reasons as well. However, claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-22 are believed to be allowable at least due to their dependency from claim 1, 9 and 18 respectively.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's IBM Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/28/06

By:   
James J. Bitetto  
Registration No. 40,513

**Mailing Address:**

**KEUSEY, TUTUNJIAN & BITETTO, P.C.**  
**20 Crossways Park North, Suite 210**  
**Woodbury, NY 11797**  
**Tel: (516) 496-3868**  
**Fax: (516) 496-3869**